

2.C.f.
/
O B S E R V A T I O N S

U P O N

A T R E A T I S E,

ENTITLED

A DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAIN OF TROY,

BY

Monfieur le CHEVALIER.

By JACOB BRYANT.



ETON:

Printed by M. POTE, 1795.

Sold by Messrs. CABELL and DAVIES, Strand, LONDON.

OBSERVATIONS

UPON

A TREATISE

ENTITLED

A DESCRIPTION OF THE PAIN OF TROU

Published by the same Author,

A TREATISE upon the Truth of the Christian Religion,

And,

BY JACOB BRYANT

A TREATISE upon the Miracles in Egypt, and the Divine
Mission of Moses.



ESTD 1753

Printed by M. Bate 1753.

Sold by M. Bate, Cambridge and Davies, London.

THE
P R E F A C E.

THE following TREATISE was taken in hand, when the Description of the Plain of Troy first came out. For as I had written upon the same subject, and concerning the Trojan War, and as there were some articles contrary to my opinion in the Description; it seemed to me by no means improper, to obviate the objections, which might arise, should my thoughts be ever made publick. And as a second Edition of this Work has been published, and probably is by this time sold, it appeared to be a proper season to send this Treatise into the World. For I should be willing to take off all undue impressions; that if my other Treatise, of more consequence than the present, should come forth, my process may be freed, if possible, from all impediment and objections.

THE
PREFACE

The following Treatise was written by a
Lecturer of the Plain of the
and was written upon the
and as there was a great
the following is a
state the question, and
ever more so. This is a
and will be found to be
to be a great
and it is to be found in
and it is to be found in
and it is to be found in
and it is to be found in

THE

THE
INTRODUCTION.

MR. DALZEL, the Translator and Editor of the Description, gives the Author Mr. le CHEVALIER, a very excellent character, as being distinguished by the variety of his *Knowledge, the vivacity of his Conversation, and the agreeableness of his Manners* : of which I make no doubt : And we may presume, that the Person must be blest with the same Knowledge and happy attainments, who could draw so fair a Picture. But these learned Gentlemen should have considered, that, however they may have been gifted with Knowledge, and with accuracy equal to that Knowledge, yet mistakes will sometimes happen : and they should shew the greatest candour and moderation to others, that the like return may be made to them.

This I mention, because there certainly is not that lenity, and mildness preserved, which their best Friends might have wished, and even an enemy expected. This will appear from the passages annexed, which will shew that they have not been

B 2
sufficiently

sufficiently upon their guard. And though some compliments are casually introduced, yet they are in a manner cancelled by the antecedent severity.

Of unnecessary critical Censure.

It is said of Dr. POCOCKE, that his account of Troas is full of errors, and obscure, p. 51. That he suffered himself to be misled by Strabo, rather than trust to his own eyes, p. 51. He is accused of diffidence and reserve, and excessive caution: by which he exposed others to the censure of temerity, when they were to hold that for certain, which he had only considered, as probable. p. 101. This is an article of accusation, which I do not quite understand. If he was cautious, and they rash, it was, I should think, their fault, and not his, if any mistake ensued. Though so little is produced in the Dissertation to his advantage, yet we are told in the Notes, (p. 100) that his merit is there over-rated,---he is so very deficient in composition---in arrangement---and his ideas are so confused. It is a matter of regret, that he should not have been able to tell distinctly, what he saw. p. 101. This is hard dealing with a person, of whom the celebrated Traveller Niebuhr, and many other unexceptionable Judges have entertained a far better opinion. What may seem extraordinary, the Author of the Treatise himself styles him---that excellent Traveller, and owns his obligations to him, p. 100, for he proved to him a very useful guide in his researches, p. 51, and even mentions him as a sure guide, p. 76. How a person, that was so excellent, and of such benefit, could be so deficient, so confused, and not able to express his mind, nor to see
with

INTRODUCTION.

with his own eyes, in short so full of errors, is past my comprehension. I only can say, if he was of such service, he deserved better treatment.

Mr. Wood is represented---as void of all merit---*negligent, obstinate, arrogant, and absurd*. p. 56, 59, 75, see p. 80 in particular. He was continually bewildered, and turned all things into Chaos and ' confusion, p. 51, 79, 80, 100. He is said p. 57, *to have deserved no mercy*: and certainly no mercy has he found.

Dr. CHANDLER is treated with some deference: yet he finally meets with his share of censure. As Dr. POCOCKE was blamed for his diffidence, so Dr. CHANDLER is accused of *confidence, and ease*: which by the explanation falls little short of presumption, indolence and assurance. For he is said *to have imposed upon the credulity of his Readers, and to have supposed, that they would adopt, without any proof, whatever he was pleased to say*. p. 55, and 101. But this treatment cannot be esteemed liberal: and should never have proceeded from a Person of learning and humanity.

STRABO is repeatedly censured: all that he knew concerning Troy, is said to have been *borrowed from one Demetrius of Scepsis*, p. 49, 57. He is mentioned, as *erroneous, and obscure*, p. 58, 59, 60: *who led others into many errors and absurdities*; and who *never had visited the place* which he described. p. 48, 49, and Notes 59.

¹ P. 75. It is here said—*Mr. Wood has viewed the Treade erroneously*. P. 77. Notes—Mention is made of *Mr. Wood's own exact description of the Coast*. A Man so erroneous and so accurate was never before seen.

This

This severity was unfortunate ; and cannot be observed without concern, when we consider, from whom it proceeded. And I hope, that I shall be excused, if I presume to point out any defects in the opinions of these learned Gentlemen. For they cannot be offended with a liberty, which they themselves have taken, especially if they are addressed with that candour and urbanity, to which every man of learning has a claim.



OBSERV-

O B S E R V A T I O N S

UPON

A T R E A T I S E, &c.

The Situation of Troy.

MR. le CHEVALIER has used great diligence in traversing the region of Troas: and has made many observations, which may deserve the notice of the World. Yet I cannot help thinking, that his zeal has sometimes transported him too far, and that there is not always that certainty in his determinations, which through prejudice, he imagined. It is my fear that he is fundamentally mistaken in respect to the situation of Troy; and that it does not by any means agree with the description given by Homer; nor with many circumstances in the course of the Poem. The City, described by the Author, of the Treatise, seems to be placed far too remote from the *ναυσάθμος*, and camp of the Grecians, upon the sea. Hence the marches, and countermarches, and other operations carried on to such a distance in that interval of ground, cannot be made to agree with the time allotted for them. He speaks of the Village *Bounarbachî* (p. 116) as being four leagues, near twelve miles, from the sea. From this place he ascended for a mile, till he arrived at a lofty eminence, surrounded for the most part with abrupt precipices: (p. 127) and upon this hill he supposes the Troy of Homer to have been founded. The nearest part of the City must therefore have been thirteen miles from the

the coast, and the ships of the Grecians. The Citadel called *Pergamus* must have been still farther, as may be seen in the Maps of the Author, (p. 1, and 115.) Now this interval between the Camp and the City seems to be far too great for the Grecians to have advanced to it with labour, and by degrees forced their way to the walls, and then to have gradually retreated, when we consider the time allotted for those operations. Let us take for example the distant movements upon that day, when Patroclus is said to have been slain. It is mentioned in the eleventh book of the Poem, that the Greeks issued from their tents in the morning, and engaged the Trojans, who had kept their station during the night *ἐπὶ δρωσῶν πεδίοιο*. Λ. v. 56.

This was a part of the Plain, of which I shall say more hereafter. The Author places it in his Map about the distance of a mile: and it is described by the Poet, as *ὀλιγος χώρος* (κ. v. 160) *a small space of land*. The engagement began, and was carried on very stubbornly till the third, or fourth hour after sun-rise, without either side giving way. But, when the sun was got somewhat high in the firmament, and according to the ancient way of reckoning, the hind and woodman had made their first meal or breakfast, the Trojans were obliged to give way.

Τημος σφῆ ἀρετῇ Δαναοὶ ῥηζάντο Φαλαγγας
Τρωων-----Λ. 90.

At that time the Grecians by dint of prowess disordered, and broke through the array of the Trojans, who accordingly retreated. They however continually faced about, till they were driven beyond the Tomb of Ilus, and the Ερινεος, or wild Fig-tree, quite up to the Scæan gate, where they made a stand.

Ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ Σκαίης τε πύλας καὶ Φηγὸν ἵκοντο,
Εὐθ' ἀρὰ δὴ ἴσαντο-----

This according to the ¹ statement and delineation of Mons. C. could not be less than thirteen miles from the ships, and coast. Agamemnon is here

¹ P. 27, and 116.

wounded,

wounded, and retires: upon which Hector encourages the Trojans, who in their turn drive the enemy quite back to the rampart. Here a very sharp fight commences: but the Greeks are still worsted, and one of the ships fired. From the City to the shipping was an additional space of thirteen miles=26. At this juncture Patroclus is sent in the armour of Achilles, who drives away the Trojans back to the very walls of their City, after they had been for a long time in possession of the rampart. This was however effected by degrees.

Ου γὰρ πῶ τι Τρῶες ἀρηιφίλων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν
Προτροπαδὴν φοβέοντο μελαιναῶν ἀπὸ νηῶν,
Ἄλλ' ἐτ' ἀρ' ἀνθίσαντο, νέων δ' ὑποείχον ἀνάγκη. IL. II. 300.

Nothing hindered Patroclus from taking the City by storm, but the interposition of the tutelary Deity. For he is said to have made four attempts to scale the wall: and seems to have three times got nearly upon it, but was driven off by the guardian of the place. In the mean time Hector sheltered himself, and his horses, under the Scean gate.

Ἐκτῶρ δ' ἐν Σκαιοῖσι πύλαις εἶχε μωνυχᾶς ἵππους. II. 711. Hence it is plain, that they had passed from the station of the ships quite up to the walls of the City another 13 miles=39. Patroclus is here slain, and Hector again takes the lead: and drives the Grecians back to their entrenchment, though not without great opposition, and delay. Here we have another addition of thirteen miles to be noticed: and the aggregate of the whole is fifty two miles: and these flights and countermarches are for the most part performed between the third, and the twelfth hour of the day: from about nine in the morning to six o'clock in the afternoon. But this is incredible, and impossible. And should we, to prevent the overrating of the distance, deduct eight or ten miles; yet the fact would be still impossible. Without considering the great fatigue, and delay in stubborn contest, few men, however expedite, and lightly equipped, could singly walk over such a space of ground in nine or ten hours; much less an army

Ἄ Τρις μὲν ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος ἔη τείχεος ὑψηλοῖο,
Πατρόκλος, τρις δ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιεφυλίξει Ἀπόλλων. II. 752.

of an hundred thousand men. The City therefore, as described by Homer, must have been much nearer : and the situation given to Troy by Mr. C. is contrary to the very evidence of the Poet.

Of the uncertainty of Authors in respect to the distance of some principal objects.

As the camp of the Grecians was a naval station, it is highly necessary, if possible, to ascertain the part of the coast, upon which it is described in the Poem ; as the situation of Troy must in a great measure be determined from it. It has been generally supposed, that this camp was upon the Hellespont, and extended from the Sigeon Promontory to the Rhœtean, and that the station of Achilles was at the former, and that of Ajax at the latter place. It is also further said, that each of these Heroes was buried near the particular promontory, where they had been stationed. These were the limits, and abutments of the Grecian camp according to both the modern and the ancient Writers upon the subject. But neither of these Promontories, especially the Rhœtean, has been ever satisfactorily pointed out. This will appear from the different accounts of the distance, which is supposed to have subsisted between them. Mr. Wood thinks, that the Rhœtean Promontory was the same as Cape Barbieri ; which according to his map is not much less than ten miles from the Sigeon, the same as cape Janisary. Strabo makes the interval to be sixty stadia ; which amount to above seven miles : Solinus represents it as forty stadia ; or near five miles. Pliny makes it thirty ; about three miles and a half. Thus they varied concerning the interval, because they had no certain boundaries, from whence they could draw a line : but each determined the two extremes according to their particular system. If we attend to the Map given by the Author of the Description, p. 102. the distance is somewhat short of four miles : and in his thirteenth chapter he states it at thirty furlongs, or somewhat more than three miles and a half. He accuses Mr. Wood, as well as M. d'Anville, of being misled by Strabo ; and asserts, in order to shew the certainty of his observations, that he measured it

it himself. *I was at the pains to ascertain this distance geometrically, and found it to be three thousand fathoms.* p. 102. But what was the object, of which he speaks; and which he measured so accurately? An interval never defined; and determined by him from imaginary abutments, about which nobody could ever agree. He blames the statement of others; and gives us his own measurement, which is equally precarious. He, however, describes the stations of the principal persons, after he has determined the camp, in the following manner. *The Tent of the Commander in chief occupied the center of the Camp: Achilles had his station at the right wing, near the Sigeon promontory; and Ajax at the left, near the Rhætean.* That Ajax and Achilles, were at the extremes according to the Poet, is certain; but that they were bounded by the Rhætean and Sigeon promontories is a notion of later date. Nothing to this purpose is said by Homer: no such names are to be found in his writings. He was a stranger both to Rhæteum and Sigeum, of which the learned Author does not seem to have been apprised.

His situation of the Grecian Camp wrong.

That the Author cannot be right in the situation of his camp may, I think, be proved from his Map, where the Scamander, and the mouth of it, called the Stomalimne, run through the Naval station of the Greeks. This cut off all communication between one part of the army, and the other: for it must have been ever an impassable¹ barrier. There was no possibility of getting over this obstruction. The Author is aware of this difficulty: and employs a whole page to obviate, or at least extenuate, the evil, which cannot after all be remedied. He, however, forms many suppositions; which, I fear, are unavailing. He places the difficulty in a fair and strong light; and owns, that, *on reflecting upon the inundations of the Simois, we should think it strange, that the army of the Greeks should have pitched their camp upon such disadvantageous ground: and especially that*

1. Of this opening, called Stomalimne, see Strabo, l. 13. p. 890. There appears also to have been a large bed of ooze, which was protruded far into the sea, and was of a great breadth. It had the name of Palæscamander, of which Pliny takes notice.—*Stagnum Palæscamander.* l. v. c. 30.

they were able to maintain their station on that ground for the space of ten years.

p. 103 To obviate these objections, he has recourse to many expedients; which will not, I believe, be deemed competent. He accordingly intimates, that the Grecians might possibly have their camp, sometimes in a different place: a circumstance never before thought of by any person, either ancient, or modern. For—*though the war continued so many years, it does not appear from Homer, that the Greeks were encamped between the Sigean and Rhætean promontories all that time.* p. 103. As I have said before, there is not a word in Homer about these promontories: but that the army was encamped before the City all that time we may be assured from many passages both in the Ilias and Odyssey: also by that negative proof, that no other encampment was ever in the least intimated. But we have positive proof: for the chief expeditions made to other places were under Achilles, which are mentioned. Iliad. I. 326. Odyss. T. 105. and at these times we are told in express terms, that Agamemnon, and consequently the main army, remained inactive before Troy. Achilles says, that upon his return he presented the General with the plunder.

----'Ο δ' οπισθε μενων παρα νηυσι Τροισι.

Δεξαμενος, δια παυρα δασασκετο----IL. I. v. 332.

The grand army was never upon any of these expeditions: but all the time in its naval encampment.

After many suppositions in consequence of a pleasing prejudice, he says, that *at last*, in the tenth year, they came to the mouth of the River, at a season, when the Simois was dry, p. 104. In the first place there is not the least evidence for this notion about their coming here first in the tenth year. And how could the drying up of the brook Simois above, affect the mouth of the Scamander, and the marsh below, which was inundated by the sea? No river that thus empties itself into the deep, ever fails at its mouth, nor are its marshes dry, for they are replenished with salt-water: and of this we are certified, concerning this place, by Strabo. This therefore could

1. L. 13. p. 890. Στομαλιμη—Palæscamander of Pliny. L. v. c. 39. p.

not have been the situation of the Camp; as all communication between one part of the army, and the other, must have been entirely interrupted. If one wing had been attacked, no assistance could have been afforded by the other. A Camp with an impassable morass in the middle was never thought of before. Pliny speaks of the Scamander, as *amnis navigabilis*, l. 5. p. 822. Who ever heard, that the mouth of a navigable river was ever destitute of water, or that its morasses and salt marshes were dry? This supposition therefore is merely formed to obviate an insuperable objection: and consequently is not adequate. Such a situation must have been likewise the most unhealthy, that could have been chosen. And here it is to be observed, that the Author, and his Editor, in the Map of Troy, call the Marsh Stomalimne by a peculiar interpretation—*The Marsh of Stoma*. By this they seem to have taken the word *σομα* to have been a proper name; which is extraordinary. The Marsh had its name from its situation, being *λιμνη προς σομα τε ποταμου*, *the Marsh at the mouth of the river*; which the Greeks expressed briefly *σομαλιμνη*. I say, it was denominated from its situation, and not from the proper name either of man or place.

Since I wrote the above, I by chance looked into Strabo, and find that this mistake is copied from the Latin version, where Stomalimne is most idly interpreted—*Palus nomine Stoma*. l. 13. p. 891. Also, p. 892, it is rendered as improperly—*Lacus cui Stoma nomen*. The learned Casaubon is justly severe upon the Author of the Version; and mentions, that he had been guilty of the like mistake in another place,—*insignis Xylandri supinitas, qui vertit Os portus, quasi legendum esset σομα λιμενος*. The Author of the View should have been more cautious, and not have taken the Latin version for a precedent.

Obscurity, arising from the different accounts.

We have seen, how different the measurements are, which have been given for that interval, between the Rhœtean, and Sigeon promontories. And not only their situation, but their identity, has not been determined. The Author, however, takes the lowest estimate, in order to obviate some objections, which may be made: and says, that the distance amounted only to three thousand fathoms, which is little more than three miles. But still this will not remedy the difficulties, which arise, and which have been mentioned. They still remain in full force. For if the distance from the right to the left of the army was after all so great, how could Agamemnon, when he called out from the ship in the center, be heard, as Homer tells us, to the two extremities. ©. v. 222. How can any human voice in the midst of shipping, and the din of war reach above a mile and an half each way, both to the right and to the left? It cannot be thought possible. This therefore according to the Poet could not be the situation of the Camp and Navy. This may be farther proved from the ships of Ajax and Protefilaus, which were upon the left —

Ενθ' εσαν Αϊαν[ος] τε νees, και Πρω[τεσι]λα[ος]. Ν. 681.

Yet Achilles, whose station was the very farthest upon the right, and as far again as that of Agamemnon, could perceive every thing which was done at the other extremity, at the time when Hector invaded that part of the camp. He saw the ship of Protefilaus set on fire,—

Λευσσω δη πα[ρα] νηυσι πυρος δηιοιο ερων. Π. 127.

And, what is more, he heard the voice of Hector so plainly, as to distinguish it from that of any other General.

Ουδε πω Ατρειδεω οπος εκλυον αυδησαντος
Εχθρης εκ κεφαλης· αλλ' Εκτορος ανδροφονοιο
Τρωσι κελευοντος περιαγνυ[ν]ται.—Π. 70.

The distance could not be so great as it is represented by the Author. For, according to the plan laid down, it must have been above three miles.

miles. According to other accounts it appears to have been far more. But let a man's voice be ever so strong, he will hardly be distinguished a league off. The camp therefore could not have been of that extent, nor situated, where it is described.

Of the θρωσμος πεδις, or Saltus Campestris.

Homer in more places than one takes notice of the Trojans being encamped—ἐπὶ θρωσμῳ πεδιοιο; which the Author says in his Index was probably the Tomb of Ilus. And in his 112th. page; the words are by him interpreted—*close upon the mound in the plain*; which mound he supposes to have been the tomb. But how could an army of fifty thousand men encamp upon a sepulchral monument, though it were as large as the Tomb of Mausolus? The Author however, not attending to this, proceeds in his notion; and tries to confirm his argument, that *the θρωσμος and the monument of Ilus were the same*, from the Expedition of Ulysses and Diomedes.—*In their way (IL. X. 414.) they meet with Dolon, the Trojan spy, who in order to shun death, with which they threaten him, informs them, that the Trojans are really encamped in the neighbourhood, (as Nestor had already told them) and that Hector is holding a Council with the Trojan Chiefs at the monument of Ilus. He adds, If the concurrence of these testimonies does not amount to a demonstration, that the θρωσμος and the Tomb of Ilus are the same, it is clear at least, that these two monuments could not be at any great distance from each other, p. 112. So far from any demonstration arising from the supposed concurrence of circumstances, there is not the least shadow of probability. In the first place we have no intimation given, that by θρωσμος was meant a monument, much less, that it was the Tomb supposed. In the next place, it is nowhere said, that it was close upon it. The words of the Poet concerning Hector are—*

Βελας βελευει θεις παρα σηματι Ιλῆ

Νοσφιν απο φλοισσῶ.—K. 415.

Hector is holding a Council at the Tomb of the noble Ilus; νοσφιν apart, and at a distance from the noise of the Camp. How a Person removing from
one

one place to another more convenient, and being separated, can make them both the same, or even near one another, I do not see. They probably chose the tomb of Ilus rather than any vacant spot, on account of its sanctity, to make their deliberations more awful and serious. The place is said to have been νοσφιν, *apart, at some distance*: but, how great that distance was, can be only known from the context. It was sufficiently remote to prevent the noise of the camp incommoding them: which noise was very great. This is plain from Agamemnon hearing it in the Grecian camp—

Αυλων, συριγγωντ' ενοπην, δμαδοντ' ανθρωπων. K. 13.

There is no reason to conclude from this description, that the place of encampment and the Tomb of Ilus were very near, much less that they were the same. Some further intimation concerning them may be found L. xi. v. 166. The Trojans had been encamped επι Θρωσμων (v. 56.) and were there in the morning regularly drawn up in full array. After a very severe conflict they were driven from it, They accordingly fled away, and were pursued by Agamemnon, who slew great numbers of them in their flight.

Ατρείδης δ' επετο σφεδανον Δαναοισι κελευων
 'Οι δε παρ' Ιλϋ σημα παλαιϋ Δαρδανιδαο,
 Μεσσον καππεδιον παρ' ερινεον εσσευοντο
 'Ιεμενοι πολεως.---v. 165.

Agamemnon followed them, at the same time calling out to his own people to pursue. In the mean while the Trojans pressed forwards by the Tomb of Ilus in the midst of the plain, and also by the Wild Fig-tree, striving to get to the City. If then the Tomb was in the middle of the plain higher up, and the Θρωσμος, as the Author allows, near the shipping, much below, they must necessarily have been two different objects, and by no means so near as might otherwise be supposed.

The word Θρωσμος is an antient term, which, I believe, does not occur in Homer above three times; and it occurs also in Apollonius Rhodius
 twice,

twice. Whether it is to be found elsewhere, I know not. The Commentators and Scholiasts vary about its meaning, but for the most part suppose it to have been ὑψηλὸς τοπὸς βυνοειδής, *a kind of high conical mound*: others affect to determine it more precisely by saying, that it was the same as Calicolone, or beautiful hill, upon which the Gods used to descend to take a view of the battle. This hill by the Scholiast, as well as by Strabo, is estimated as five stadia in circumference,---Κ. 160. γ. 3. σαδίων πέντε τὴν περιμέτρον.---This does not amount to 1200 feet in diameter at the bottom: and as all conical hills gradually decrease towards the summit; the diameter and superficial contents must be there far less: and the amount could not well be above twenty acres. But how can it be supposed, that the Trojan army, which in book 8th. v. 558. is estimated at fifty thousand men, could encamp within such a space of ground: or upon any hill βυνοειδής? More especially if we consider their chariots and horses, for they encamped συν ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν, which must have demanded infinitely more room. The principal persons who have given their opinion about this ancient term, are the Scholiasts, Hesychius, Eustathius and Suidas. But they were all a great many Centuries after the Poet, most of them above a thousand years: and all that they have said is mere matter of opinion, which is contradicted by the whole tenour of the History.

Were I to speak my mind, I should imagine, that word ὄρωσμος of the Grecians was perfectly analogous to the Saltus of the Romans. By the latter was meant a passage between woods, or hills, bounded by them on on each side: and answered in some degree to a lawn among the English: only it was generally more wide. We read of the Saltus Pyrenæi, Saltus Castulonensis, Saltus Mauritanix, Saltus Vasconum, Saltus Alpium: mentioned by Cæsar, Pliny and other Writers. These were passages, Trajectus inter fauces et angustias Montium, which Generals used to endeavour timely to occupy. There were others between woods frequented by Hunters, Ovid mentions *saltus venantibus apti*: 5 Epist. 27. and Virgil speaks of some as of great extent—*magnum canibus circumdare saltus*. 1. Georg. 140. Such I take the ὄρωσμος to have been. The plain of

D

Troy

Troy reached upwards from the naval Station to the City, but in one part it was in some degree contracted by the hills on each side: yet not so much, but that it afforded full room for the Trojans to encamp. It must have been a place well adapted to that purpose, being a part of the rising plain, but flanked on each side by the *αγκωνες*, some projected parts, or abutments of the Hills, which afforded great security. In consequence of this we find that the Trojans were with difficulty driven from this station, which was the first place of consequence in the route from the Grecian Navy. The second was the tomb of Ilus; next the Erineos: and last of all the *Φηγος* or Beech at the Scean Gate. The other objects mentioned in the course of the Poem lay not in this direct line. The two prominences mentioned above, as formed by the hills on each side of that part of the plain called Throsmos, are precisely described by Strabo. He accordingly tells us, that from the Idean Mountains—*δυσὶ Φησιν ἡ ἀγκωνας ἐκτείνεσθαι πρὸς τὴν θαλάτταν*,---two elbows, like promontories, extended themselves towards the sea, but did not reach it, for where they ended downward, the city New Ilium was situated: but the original City according to his conception was at some distance above. Between these was the Trojan Camp, but low down in the plain.

Nector, when he calls up Diomedes asks him,-----

Οὐχ' αἰεὶς, ὥς Τρῶες ἐπὶ θρωσμῷ πεδίοιο
Εἶαται ἀγγὶ νεῶν, ὀλίγος δ' ἐστὶ χώρος ἐρυκεί.---K. 160.

Do not you perceive that the Trojans are encamped upon the Saltus in the plains, and a very small interval separates them from us? In another place it is said—

-----ὅτι δῆλοι ἐγγυθὶ νηῶν
Καίισι πυρὰ πολλὰ.---L. IX. 76.

The enemy has lighted up many fires very near to the Ships.

† L. 13. p. 892. *Αγκων* is very improperly by the Translator rendered *Convallis*. It means quite the contrary. *Αγκος* is a valley; but *αγκων* signifies a projection, like a man's elbow. It is said of Patroclus—*τρὶς μὲν ἐπ' ἀγκωνος βῆ τειχεος*—IL. II. v. 702. *He three times got upon a projecting part of the wall.* The word is used by Sophocles in the plural *αγκωνες*, which in the Scholia is very truly rendered—*τας ἀκρας των ορων*. Ajax Μασίγ. So also,—*μεγας και ὑπεροχος αγκων* *Εξανεχαι γαιης*—Apollon. Rhod. L. 2. v. 369. *a huge towering promontary rose up in air.*

That

That I am not wrong in the situation, which I have given to the Trojan place of encampment, may be shewn from other passages in the Poet. The Throsmos or Saltus Campestris, where the fires were lighted, was according to my opinion, a particular part of the plain of Troy. Homer speaking of these fires says----Θ. v. 558.----

Χίλι' αῖρ' ἐν πεδίῳ πυρὰ καίετο, παρ δὲ ἑκάστῳ
ἔιατο πεντήκοντα σέλας πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο.

We find, that these fires were all lighted up in the plain: there therefore must have been the encampment: and Θρωσμος πεδιοιο was manifestly Θρωσμος ἐν πεδίῳ. Hence it could not relate to any tumulus or τοπος βανοειδης. Had it been on a hill, Homer would never have said that it was in a plain. I have likewise mentioned, that places of this nature were by their situation not only bounded on each side with hills or mountains, but oftentimes with woods and forests. That this part of the plain was between eminences of this sort, I have shewn from the very nature of Saltus; and proved it from the evidence of Strabo. It is likewise manifest from the account given by the Poet, that it lay close to some very extensive woods: otherwise how could they upon such a sudden emergency have immediately procured fuel for a thousand fires: especially as each of these fires was so large, as to have fifty persons reposing themselves round them. There must have been an ample forest to have afforded such conveniences so soon. Such was the place of encampment, which the Trojans occupied, ἐγγυθι νηων.

Farther account of the City.

But however near to the Grecian Ships the Trojans may have encamped, they at the same time could not have been at any very great distance from the City. The interval was by no means so large, as has been imagined; of which I have already produced proofs. It may be farther ascertained from that passage in the Poet, where Hector orders provisions to be brought from Troy to the encampment ἐπὶ Θρωσμῳ.

Ἐκ πόλιν δ' ἀξασθε βοας, καὶ ἰφια μῆλα
καρπαλιμῶς, δῖον ἔμελιφρονά σινησεσθε. Θ. 505.

Bring immediately both Oxen and Sheep from the City: and procure a sufficient quantity of Wine. We cannot suppose, that the General sent for these articles ten or eleven miles, and that they were to be brought as many more to the camp. The flocks of sheep would not at this rate have arrived before morning. The City therefore could not have been so far either from the Camp, or from the ships of the Grecians, as has been supposed.

But I need not have gone so far for my proofs, as the Poet in another place describes the situation of Troy so plainly, that I should have thought it could not be mistaken. The Author, as we have seen, places it above Bounarbachi, *an eminence of Mount Ida*, surrounded with precipices, p. 27. and above four leagues from the sea. But in the twentieth book of the Poet, v. 215, we have a very different situation afforded.

Δαρδανον αν πρωτον τεκετο νεφεληγεσστα Ζευς,
 Κτισσε δε Δαρδανιην, επει επω Ιλιος ιρη
 Εν πεδιω πεπολιςσο πολισ μεροπων ανθρωπων,
 'Αλλ' εθ' υπερείας ωκεον πολυπιδακος Ιδης.

The purport of this is, that Dardanus the son Jupiter, built the ancient City Dardania, which he intimates stood high up in the Country. Troy, says he, which is situated in the plain, was not yet founded: but people still continued to reside at the bottom of Mount Ida. Plato says, that they for some time resided only on the tops of hills for fear of a second deluge. Be that as it may, we find for certain, from the account above, that the City Troy could not have stood, where the Author has placed it. It was not situated on Mount Ida, nor upon any mountain or hill like that near Bounarbachi: nor even at the bottom of a hill: but εν πεδιω, at a distance in the Plain, and much nearer to the Grecian station, than he has imagined.

* The Editor says, that *eminence of Bounarbachi*, was a part of the range of hills, which went all under the Name of Idæan Mountains.—Notes to p. 59.

Concerning the Author's strictures upon Strabo.

It is said by the Author concerning Strabo, that he never visited Troas: and that he depended upon the testimony of one Demetrius of Scepsis, in whom he does not seem to have much confidence, whom he sometimes accuses of contradiction, whom he finds often times differing from Homer; but whose description he adopts for want, it should seem, of one, that was more accurate. p. 49. This, I think, is by no means a fair description, and is introduced to the Reader under much false colouring. He speaks of both persons in a very harsh stile, and blames them for inaccuracy and mistakes. In speaking of their determination of the Scamander and Simois he uses these words, *This is certainly a very obscure and unsatisfactory explication: and Demetrius and Strabo are equally censurable, the one for committing the blunder, and the other for adopting, and endeavouring to give it authenticity.* p. 59. But why does he suppose these learned men so ignorant and arraign them so bitterly? And what proof does he bring of their being in the wrong, except his own private opinion? It may be said that he visited the Country: so did they as will be shewn. Demetrius was a native of Scepsis, and lived upon the very spot in the midst of the region Troas: and from the situation he (whether true or false) imagined the place of his residence to have been of old the royalty of Æneas: Strabo. L. 13. p. 905. He was an hearer of Crates and Aristarchus and reputed a Man of learning.

The place of his birth was by no means despicable: for, when learning began to be diffused by the Ionic School, it spread soon as far as Halicarnassus and Rhodus south: and to Abydus, Lampascus, and Cyzicus in the north: and men of great learning made their appearance. Of these Scepsis had at times its share: Strabo, L. 13. p. 906. 7, mentions several philosophers from hence: such as Eraclius, and Coriscus of the Socratic School; and Neleus who obtained the libraries both of Aristotle and Theophrastus: also the philosopher Metrodorus: and the person, who is very improperly stiled by the Author—one Demetrius, quasi ὁ τυχερὸν αὐτοῦ.

Strabo may sometimes think differently from Demetrius; but this shews, that he was not blindly led by him. That he placed little confidence

confidence in him is very unwarrantably said: yet it is asserted, that *the manner in which he* (Strabo) *endeavours to create a confidence in that Writer, seems to prove, that he reposed little in himself.* p. 57. How then came Strabo to apply to him so often; and to borrow so much from him: above all things to speak of him, as very safely to be trusted concerning the region of Troy.-----

Εμπειρος ων των τοπων, ως αν επιχωριος ανηρ Δημετριος:----*as being thoroughly acquainted with the places mentioned, and a native of the Country?* L. 13. p. 898. The Author therefore is surely mistaken in supposing that Strabo held Demetrius in *little confidence.*

The authority of this Writer is continually quoted by ¹ Strabo: and he is mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium, Harpocration, Athenæus, and other Writers. Diogenes Laertius introduces him among the twenty illustrious persons of that name. He styles him—¹ *πολυστοιχος και ευγενης, και φιλολογος ακρως.* Notwithstanding this he is accused by the Author of *contradiction*: that is, of contradicting himself. Otherwise every body that differs from another, must necessarily contradict him. The particular place referred to is in Book 13. p. 900: and precedes the passage above, where Strabo gives him so fair a character. Demetrius had been speaking of some towns and rivers of Troas, in which he owns, that he differs from others: Strabo accordingly says---*ταυτα μεν ουν ενστασιν εχει τοιαυτην.* By which is meant, if we trust to the Latin version, *Hæc ergo sic contradicuntur*,---*that these things imply a contradiction.* But even this is not contradicting himself. Besides, this is not the sense of the original, to which the Author should have applied. The true meaning of the word amounts to this only, that these articles admit of debate: and are liable to be controverted. Hence *ενστασις* is interpreted by Hesychius, *ανταγωνισμα*, an opposition, dissent, or verbal controversy. The purport of the sentence ---*ταυτα μεν ουν ενστασιν εχει τοιαυτην*---seems to be---*These articles are attended with this difference and contrariety.*

¹ Εα δε της Σκηψεως και ο Δημετριος εστιν. ου μεμνημεθα πολλακις, ο των Τρωικων διακοσμων εξηγησασμενος, Τρωα-
ματικος. L. 13. p. 907. See also L. 1. p. 101.

² See Vossius de Scriptoribus Græcis. L. 1. c. 21, p. 133.

³ In vitâ Demetrii Phalerii. L. v. Segm. 86. p. 312.

The purport of Strabo's words may be learned from the context. Demetrius had written many books in order to illustrate Homer: and among other articles to authenticate the geographical part of his chief poem. In consequence of this he had mentioned some places, which Strabo did not allow; such as Allazonium, and Alube, where the Poet had supposed that there were mines of silver. These, Strabo says, admitted of some doubt, and were liable to be disputed. But we must not hence infer that he had no opinion of Demetrius. The contrary appears from his very words in the same page, which the Author quotes and totally disregards, p. 57—

Τάλλα δε απολαμβάνομεν, η τα τε πλείστα δειν προσεχειν, ως ανδρι εμπειρω και εντοπιω, φροντισαντι δε περι τουτων τοσαυτον, ωτε τριακοντα βιβλος συγγραφαι σιγνων εξηγησιν μνηρω πλειονων εξηκοντα τε καλολογα των Τρωων. *In the other articles I agree with him, and think, that in most things he may be safely trusted, as being a person of experience, and a native of the Country; and who had considered these things so carefully, that he wrote a comment consisting of thirty Books, upon little more than sixty verses of Homer (concerning the Countries and Cities mentioned) in the Catalogue of the Trojans. L. 13 p. 900.* Who can after this with the least justice say, that Strabo had no opinion of Demetrius? There is nothing intimated of his contradicting himself; nor of the least inconsistency. The Author of the travels seems here, and in some other places, to put a force upon history, in order to make it applicable to his purpose. But truth is fixed, and inflexible, and we in vain try to warp it. It is like straining a bow of steel the wrong way; which will certainly recoil: and probably wound the person, who misapplies it.

Strabo further accused and acquitted.

It is more than once said of Strabo, that he was never in the region of Troas: that it was a part of the world, which he had never visited: but that he borrowed all his knowledge from Demetrius. p. 48. 49. I know not of any authority for this assertion. Strabo proves himself to have been a diligent traveller, and a curious inspector of places. He was a native of Amasia in Pontus; and had visited the regions southward as far

far as Egypt. And he affirms in express terms, that he had personally viewed those Countries, which lay to the west, from Armenia, quite to Hetruria. Besides as he came from Amasia in Pontus, his route westward was almost in a direct line through the region of Troas. Indeed most persons, who passed from Asia Minor to Europe, or the reverse, went by Troas, and Abydus. The armies of Darius, and Xerxes, though they came from the south of Asia, betook them to this part of the world in order to cross over. And Alexander, Agesilaus, and other Grecians, on the European side, made the same circumflex to get into Asia. When Vespasian set out for Egypt from Athens, he took the same circuit, and passed by Abydus, and Troas. Hence we may be morally certain, that Strabo took the same course, and did not trust implicitly to Demetrius; but in a great degree to his own experience.

But to whom could he have more justly trusted, than to a man of learning, and a native of the very province, of which he gave an account: and the history of which he had made his particular study. Lastly, a person, who, if the Pagus Iliensium were Troy, lived within sight of it? for such was the distance and situation of Scepsis, that it could be but a few miles distant from either Ilium, or any place in Troas. In short this Gentleman has unduly tried to set aside the evidence of the two most unexceptionable witnesses, that could possibly be produced.

1 His words are very plain and determinate. — Ερουμιν δη την μεν επιθοντες αυτοι της γης και της θαλαττης επηλθομεν δε επι δυσιν μεν απο Αρμενιαις μεχρι των κατα Σαρδωνα τοπων της Τυρρηνιας. — ουδε των αλλων δε εδε εις αν ευρεθειη των γεωγραφησαντων πολυ τι ημων μαλλον επιηλυθως των λεχθεντων διασηματων. Strabo L. 2. p. 177. We find that he says, — *No Geographer whatever had gone over so much ground in every direction, as he had traversed.* And, if he personally visited all the Countries from Armenia to Hetruria, we must necessarily among those reckon Troas, as it lay the most obvious of any.

Strabo accused of obscurity.

It is further said (p. 59.) that Strabo is not only guilty of blunders; but, that he is also very obscure. But does not this seeming deficiency arise often from errors in the manuscripts, as well as from want of attention in ourselves; and from our not being sufficiently acquainted with his language, and mode of writing? This, I must confess, has been often my case: and my doubts and misapprehensions have been removed by a more careful perusal. We are likewise apt to suppose things obscure, and faulty, when they do not accord with our pre-conceived notions. Thus a passage in Strabo, which the Author, and his learned Editor, think very wrong, appears to be quite genuine and consistent. It is said by Homer, that Achilles would one day be killed,—*Ενι Σκαιησι πυλῃσι*. X. 360.

But according to Dares Phrygius, and Dictys Cretensis, he was slain in the Temple of Thymbrean Apollo: which opinion the Author embraces. Strabo gives a description of this Temple, as it was supposed to have stood in his time, of which however we have no intimation in Homer. He places it at the distance of fifty stadia from Ilium: which the Author thinks is not truly represented; and he accordingly proposes an alteration. The passage is as follows.—*πλησιον γαρ εστι το πεδιον η Θυμβρα, και ο δι αυτης ρεων ποταμος Θυμβριος, εμβαλλων εις το Σκαμανδρον κατα το Θυμβραις Απολλωνος Ιερον*. τὸ δὲ νῦν Ἰλίου καὶ πεντήκοντα σταδίας διεχει. L. 13. p. 893.—*for near (to the place above-mentioned) is the plain of Thymbra; and the river Thymbrius, which runs through it, and empties itself into the Scamander, hard by the Temple of Thymbrean Apollo, at the distance of fifty stadia from the present City Ilium*. Nothing can be more intelligible than this description: but it does not suit with the opinion either of the Author, or the Editor. They therefore think, that a full stop should be put after *Σκαμανδρον*,—*The Thymbrius discharges itself into the Scamander*. The difficulty, which then arises, is to find out a meaning for—*κατα το Θυμβραις Απολλωνος Ιερον*—which

1 The name of the river was Thymbres, Thymbræ, and Thymbris, according to Homer, and the best Writers.

is deprived of its former connexion, and stands unsupported. The Author has found an expedient. He says, that *Strabo will be found to support his idea, if we are allowed to make a small change of the common punctuation in the passage, where he speaks of this Temple. The Thymbrius, says he, discharges itself into the Scamander. If we suppose a stop here, we learn from the phrase, which immediately follows, that the Temple of Apollo is to be found near the Thymbrius, at the distance of fifty stadia from New Ilium. This appears to be the true meaning of the Geographer. p. 111. Phrase call ye it? I hardly ever encountered such a phrase before. This surely is *fumum ex fulgore dare*; and the adverse of elucidation. I wonder that his learned Friend, the Editor should support the notion: yet he undertakes to explain it in the following manner. *It is proposed, instead of the comma after Σκαμανδρον, to put a full stop: and to construe what follows, (κατα το Θυμβραις Απολλωνος Ἱερον) thus, Το Ἱερον Θυμβραις Απολλωνος εστι κατα. The Temple of Thymbraean Apollo, is near the banks of the river. It is very laudable to assist a friend at a crisis: but whether any effectual help is in this instance afforded, I much question. By this separation, and abridgment, we have a mutilated part of a sentence presented to us, consisting of five words. It stands absolute, without any verb, except by an arbitrary insertion of the word εστι, and without any thing properly predicated, and determined. Yet, by the transposition of the leading word κατα, we are to understand, not only a river, but the banks of a river, and the situation of the Temple upon that river. At the same time, these words, even as they are thus new modelled, afford not the least intimation to this purpose. All this labour has been expended to make the Temple correspond with the supposed scene of Achilles's nuptials, and death: to prove a fiction by a fable. And during the process Dares Phrygius, and Dictys Cretensis, are preferred to both Homer and Strabo.**

The Author does not seem to know, that the Histories attributed to these two persons are notorious forgeries, and the characters merely ideal. He goes so far as to say, that *they were the first that gave an historical detail of that war, in which they themselves had been actually engaged, p. 40.*

Concerning

Concerning a passage in Herodotus.

I should be sorry to be esteemed unnecessarily scrupulous; much more to be thought captious, or severe. Yet I know not how to agree with the Author in the interpretation of another passage, which he quotes from Herodotus, and seems totally to have mistaken. It relates to the march of Xerxes towards the Hellespont in his way to Greece; where it is said, L. vii. C. 42. p. 530. Wesseling: that he passed from the south upwards through that part of Mysia, called by some Æolis and then—*την Ἰδην λαβὼν ἐς ἀριστερὴν χεῖρα* *ἤτε ἐς τὴν Ἰλιάδα γῆν*—*keeping Mount Ida on his left hand he came into the region of Ilium.* This by the Author is rendered—*advancing towards the left branch of Mount Ida they entered the Trojan territory.* p. 43. His learned Friend, the Editor, tries to support this interpretation, and says, *this is certainly the meaning of*—*την Ἰδην λαβὼν ἐς ἀριστερὴν χεῖρα*: and not—*having Ida on the left.* For it was impossible, that the army of Xerxes marching along the coast from Sardis to Abydus could have *Mount Ida on the left.* To me it seems very possible: and so it will appear to any person, who knows, what is meant by Mount Ida, as it was described by Homer. It appeared so to the Historian himself, who was a native of Halicarnassus, and must have been acquainted with the Country. The purport of his words are plain: and it is impossible, without the greatest violation of the text, and of language in general, to suppose, that—*την Ἰδην λαβὼν ἐπ' ἀριστερὴν χεῖρα*, can signify *advancing towards the left branch of Ida.* These learned Gentlemen are certainly deceived in their notion about Mount Ida: and then very naturally try to make Herodotus speak a language, which agrees with their conceptions. Homer often makes mention, *Ἰδαίων ὄρεων*, of the *Idæan Mountains* collectively, which compose a long ridge from Lectum to Abydus, and so on to Bithynia and Thrace. Strabo L. 13. p. 873. But there was one eminence in particular near the sea to the south, which he distinguished by the name of Ida, the same as Lectum, the summit of which was Gargarus. Hither the Poet makes the Deities often resort to view the two armies. Below stood a Temple and altar, where Jupiter was worshiped by the natives. To this moun-

tain also the Poet makes this Deity betake himself, when he left Olympus. IL. O. v. 47, 48.—

Ιδην δ' ἵκανε πολυπιδάκα, μητέρα ~~τη~~ Θηρων.
Γαργαρον, ενθα δὲ οἱ τεμένος, βώμος τε θυεῖς.

In another place he describes the God as seated here, when Juno introduces Somnus, by whose influence Jupiter is ¹ overpowered.

Ἦρῃ δὲ κραιπνῶς προσέβησάτο Γαργαρον ἀκρον
Ιδης ὑψηλῆς----ξ. 292.

Ida and Lectum, which were properly the same, formed the boundary of Troas to the south west, which they separated from Mysia Æolica. The City Gargaris, Antandros, and Adramyttium stood to the south. Upon the sea-coast below was a bay called Sinus Idæus, and Adramyttenus. Strabo. L. 13. p. 874. In the thirteenth Book of Homer it is said of Neptune, that he took his stand upon a hill in Samothrace—

----ῥψα ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς Σαμῶς ὑληέσσης, v. 12.

from whence he had a prospect of Mount Ida,

-----ἐνθεν γὰρ ἐφαίνετο πᾶσα μὲν Ἰδῆ,
φαίνεται δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις, καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν.

He had also from hence a full view of the city of Priam, and the Grecian navy: The Island Samothrace lays directly opposite to the City Troas and to Gargarus and Lectum above it, the mountains particularly called ³ Ida. This was the eminence which Xerxes left upon his left hand, when he passed upwards from Sardis to Abydus. The route of his army from Lydia

¹ Ὡς ὁ μὲν ἀτρεμῶς εὐδὲ πατρὸς ἀνα Γαργαρον ἀκρῶ. IL. E. 352.

Ιδην δ' ἵκεσθην πολυπιδάκα, μητέρα Θηρων, —Λεκτον—IL. E. v. 283.

The true Ida of Homer was Lectum; and Gargarus; which was the summit. See also, O. v. 152.

² Strabo informs us, that Lectum was the Ida of the Poet—οὕτως τῇ Ποιητῇ φραζόντος τὸ Λεκτον, καὶ γὰρ ὅτι τῆς Ἰδης ἐστὶ τὸ Λεκτον. L. 13. p. 874.

If Homer speaks of Lectum and Gargarus as Ida proper, and Ida by way of eminence: Herodotus surely may be permitted to describe it in the same manner.

³ Strabo above. St. Paul says,—*loosing from Troas*, we came with a strait course to Samothracia. Acts. 16. v. 11.

northward

northward was by a passage between Mount Ida Gargarus and the other Idæan Mountains. It is very clearly described by Herodotus. First to the river Caicus, and Mysia. Then to the left of Mount Cane through Atarneus to Carine, and the country about Thebe by Adramyttium and Antandros. Here rose the two summits called Gargarus and Lectum which composed the true Ida, and which separated the two regions: and by these to the east was the pass to Troas. Xerxes therefore, when he came near to Adramyttium, and Antandros, proceeded through this passage,----την Ἰδην λαβὼν ἐς ἀριστερὴν χεῖρα :---taking *Ida on his left¹ hand* and in this manner----ἤε ἐς τὴν Ἰλίου γῆν,---pursued his way into the region of the *Iliensis*.

I cannot help adding, by way of corollary, that the situation of Troy, and of the Grecian Camp according to Homer's idea, seems to be in some degree pointed out in the passages above. For the Mountain Gargarus, as well as Lectum, appears plainly to be the Ida κατ' ἑξοχὴν, to which both the Poet and Historian refer. To this eminence Homer brings Jupiter that he may have a full view of the City and of the Ships---Ἰδὴν δ' ἵκανεν---Γαργαρον ;

Αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κορυφῇσι καθέζετο κυδαί γαίων,

Εἰσορῶν Τρώων τε πόλιν, καὶ νηῆς Ἀχαιῶν. Θ. v. 52.

He arrived at Ida Gargarus --There on the summit he seated himself, &c. having in full view the City of Troy, and the naval station of the Grecians. Hence I am led to think, that the City of the Poet must have been in the southern part of Troas, and at no very great distance from this mountain, which was the boundary of the Country downward. The camp of the Grecians must have been likewise in the vicinity upon the shore: and not, as generally represented, at the distance of eighteen or twenty miles to the north of Ida Gargarus with hills and promontories intervening. Virgil therefore, and those, from whom he borrowed, were in the right, when they placed the City and Camp in view of Tenedos:

¹ Herod. L. vii. p. 530.

² I have shewn from Strabo, and from Homer himself, that Lectum, was the same as Ida. and Gargarus (ἀκρον) was the summit of Ida, and they stood near the shore. Xerxes could not enter the Region Iliensis without leaving them on his left hand. See Strabo L. 13. as quoted above.

Est in conspectu Tenedos: for this Island was not far from Ida Gargarus, and Lectum, and opposite to Achæum, which was so denominated from being the supposed station of the Grecian ships, and the place of the encampment. Strabo L. 13. p. 894. Here is the particular spot, from whence the situation of Troy to the east should be investigated; were it possible to be found. And here Strabo sought for it; but no discovery could be made.

Strabo again vindicated.

The Author more than once intimates, that Strabo had never visited the region of Troas; and that all the intelligence he had, was borrowed from one person. But how is this known; and what evidence has the Author in proof of this article, which he so roundly asserts? He does not in the least disclose, by what authority he is led to frame so unfavourable a conclusion. What therefore he says so incautiously, may possibly come home to himself: and he may be in his turn blamed *for relying so much upon the credulity of his Readers, as to take for granted that they would adopt upon his bare assertion all the wonderful things, which he shall tell them*, p. 55. It is manifest from the express words of this excellent Geographer, in his account of Phrygia and Troas, that he had recourse to many celebrated Writers for information: and this he shews in the compass of a very few ¹ pages. Among others he mentions ² Theopompus, Heraclides Ponticus, Hellanicus Lesbicus, Eudoxus, Lycurgus, Hestius Alexandrinus, Ephorus Cyzacenus, Scylax Cariandensis, Artemidorus, Hegesianax, and Charon Lampfacenus, who was a native of this Country. There are others, to whom he applies, as may be seen in the course of his Writings. The Author therefore is certainly too severe in his treatment of Strabo, with whom he joins Mr. Wood; especially, when he says, of the latter, *He seeks for a partner in misfortune, and he finds one in Strabo; who indeed is mistaken, like himself, but not upon the spot, as he*

¹ L. 1. p. 12. L. 13. p. 873.

² The true place or name may be found in the Index of Strabo; and the names of many other Writers mentioned by him.

alleges,

alleges, for it is well known, and he ought not to be ignorant of it, that Strabo speaks of the Troade only on the authority of Demetrius of Scepsis, p. 86. It is so far from being well known, that the contrary is the truth. The ancient Authors above mentioned shew it to be an unjust accusation. Besides, as I have before said, to what Writer among others could Strabo more properly apply, than to a person of such repute: who was born, and resided in that Country, and who made the history of Troy his particular study? But to all this the Author seems to have been a stranger.

A Farther Vindication of the Grecian Geographer.

Homer places the source of the river Scamander at a distance from Troy, in the summit of one of the Idæan Mountains; and from the same mountains he makes the chief rivers of Phrygia arise. They run in very different directions, and he mentions their particular names. Among these were the Granicus, Æsepus, and Scamander.

Γρηνικὸς τε, καὶ Αἰσηπὸς, διὸς τε Σκαμανδρὸς. M. v. 21.

Demetrius affords testimony to this, and adds, that the head of the Scamander was in a Mountain called Cotylus; and was distant an hundred and twenty stadia (near fifteen miles) from Scepsis; which was in the vicinity of Ilium. He says farther, that all those rivers, mentioned by Homer, took their rise from the same eminence. Strabo L. 13. p. 898. This account is very plain; and one would imagine, could not be controverted. But this disposition of the river in the Mountain above-mentioned, and its proceeding from one fountain, does not seem to agree with some lines of the Poet in another place; and appeared to Strabo himself to stand in need of a little explanation. For the Poet tells us, that Achilles and Hector, in their course near the walls of Troy, came more than once to two springs, which are styled the fountains of the Scamander; and that they issued from the same spot, and that one of them was a hot spring and the other very cold.

Κρουνῶ δ' ἱκανὸν καλλιερῶ· ἐνθα δὲ πηγαι
 Δοίαι ἀναΐσσοσι Σκαμανδρὸς δινεῦτος.
 Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὕδατι λιαρῶ ῥεεῖ, ἀμφὶ δὲ καπνὸς
 Γίνεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὥσπερ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο.
 Ἡ δ' ἕτερη θέρει προῖκε εἰκνυῖα χαλαζῇ, κτλ. χ. v. 147.

Strabo very properly makes it his endeavour to conciliate these two different accounts. But, in effecting this, he has again the misfortune of incurring the censure of Mr. le Chevalier, and of his learned Friend. The former quotes at large the solution of Strabo, but disapproves of it greatly---*This, says Strabo, is difficult: for no warm springs are now to be found in the place; nor is the source of the Scamander there, but in the mountain: and there are not two of them, but only one. It is probable then, that the warm springs have disappeared, but the cold spring, running from the Scamander by a subterraneous passage, rises up near this place; or, because this water is hard by the Scamander, it likewise is called the fountain of the river: for in this way a river may be said to have many sources.* This, says the Author, is certainly a very obscure and unsatisfactory explication, and Demetrius and Strabo are equally censurable, the one for his negligence in committing the blunder, and the other for adopting it, and endeavouring to give it authenticity. p. 59. From the latter part of the passage quoted, it is not indeed easy to collect any precise meaning; but in the preceding part Strabo is clear, and explicit in following Demetrius, who places the source of the Scamander in Mount Cotylus. Notes p. 59. What, the least proof can be brought, that Demetrius was wrong? Yet it is insisted upon, that he was deceived, and the Editor adds—*This may be considered, as the passage, which has misled, in a greater, or less degree, almost all the modern Travellers, who have visited the Troade. Into what errors, and absurdities it contributed to lead Mr. Wood in particular will be pointed out in a subsequent Chapter.* p. 59.

I cannot be induced to think so meanly of Demetrius; who appears to me to be too severely treated, as well as Strabo; when it is said of them, that they are both equally censurable, *the one for committing the blunder, and the other for giving it authenticity*, *ibid.* Nor do I think, that

that the solution afforded by Strabo, concerning the two passages in Homer, is *so very obscure, and unsatisfactory*. And, whereas, the Author says, that *Strabo, having once admitted the doctrine of this observer, should have endeavoured in the next place to reconcile it with the poems of Homer*. p. 58. Strabo does endeavour to make them correspond, and in my opinion effects it very satisfactorily. What is extraordinary, his very words, as we have seen, are quoted by the Author. In the original they stand thus.

Παρεχει δε λογον, ως φησιν ο Ποιητης. ——— Ουτε γαρ θερμα νυν εν τω τοπω ευρισκεται, ουδε η τς Σκαμανδρς πηγη ενταυθα, αλλ' εν τω ορει και μια, ου δυο. Τα μεν ουν θερμα εκλελειφθαι εικος. το δε ψυχρον κατα διαδοσιν υπεκρεον εκ τς Σκαμανδρς κατα τστο ανατελλειν το χωριον, η και δια το πλησιον ειναι τς Σκαμανδρς, και τστο το υδωρ λεγεσθαι τς Σκαμανδρς πηγην. ουτω γαρ λεγονται πλειους πηγαι τς αυτς ποταμς. L. 13. p. 899.

The Author has given of this passage no remote interpretation: but with submission I fear not sufficiently precise: and as the Greek language, from the nature of its idiom, abounds with Ellipses, something must be supplied from the context, in order to give the full meaning of Strabo. I shall therefore venture to explain the purport of his words in the following manner. *The words of Homer, as he expresses himself, require some consideration.* ——— *For neither is there at this time any fountain of hot water in the place (mentioned by Homer, x. v. 147.) nor is the source of the Scamander there; but above in the Mountain; and even here there are not two springs, but one only. It is probable that the hot spring no longer exists: and that the cold spring, because it perhaps flowed from the Scamander by a subterranean passage, and rose near the place alluded to, or else because it was in the vicinity of the river, was on that account esteemed a fountain of the Scamander. For from such circumstances many fountains may be attributed to the same river.* In the course of this reasoning I see nothing unsatisfactory, or obscure. And so far, in my humble opinion, is this intelligent Geographer from misleading people, that he is the surest guide, upon whom they can depend. If then it should be again asked—*How are we to reconcile these seeming contrarieties?* we may answer—by that just observation of Strabo at the close; when he says, *many fountains may be attributed to the same river.*

Interpret the lines of Homer conformably to this observation, and all the seeming inconsistency, and contradiction will immediately cease.

Κρηνω δ' ἱκανον καλλιρροω, ενθα δε πηγαι
Δοιαι αναϊσσοσι Σκαμανδρε δινηεντος. IL. x. 147.

They arrived at two basons of fine water, from which two fountains of the Scamander issue forth. The chief source of the river being in the Idæan hills, does not hinder, but that there may have been many subordinate streams running into it in different directions. Instead therefore of interpreting *δοιαι πηγαι* in a limited manner *the two fountains*; let the words be rendered at large,—*They came to two springs of the river*; two out of many, every article will be plain and consistent.

They had no relation to the Scamander.

We have seen, that the Scamander of the Poet took its rise among the Mountains of Ida: but the Author supposes, that the true source of it was at the springs beneath Bounarbachi. This situation is so different: that, one would think, it could never be made to agree with the former. The Editor however tries to reconcile them and make them correspond; but I am afraid not very successfully. He accordingly says, that the *Scamander might be said, with sufficient propriety to descend from the Idæan Mountains, as the eminence of Bounarbachi, where the sources of that river are really to be found, was a part of the range of hills, which went all under the name of Idæan Mountains.* p. 59. I am obliged to dissent entirely. Nothing of this sort can be said with the least degree of propriety. The whole is an unavailing expedient to support a weak argument. These springs are not to be found at Bounarbachi, but a mile below in the plain; as may be proved from the Author's testimony in his own map. p. 115. Here he says, that Bounarbachi is situated *on an eminence at the end of a spacious plain.* The springs are a mile below, and in that plain; and far removed from any summit of Mount Ida. The source therefore of the Scamander could not be here, nor could the hill above Bounarbachi be Troy: which,

which, as I have before mentioned, was not situated on an eminence, but *εν πεδιῳ*, in a plain.

Concerning the two rivers, the Simois and Scamander.

Whether the position and course of the Scamander can be now ascertained, may be uncertain: but, I think, we may be sure, that the stream described by the Author, as such, could never be that river. Yet he thinks, that Demetrius, Strabo, Mr. Wood, and Dr. Chandler have been in an error about the two rivers, and have mistaken the Simois for the Scamander. He therefore tries to enhance the character of the secondary stream Simois, whose source he places below Bounarbachi, and to make it, contrary to the best evidence, the principal river, the true Scamander. But this notion is attended with numberless difficulties. For the Scamander of the Author is a very contemptible rivulet; and in its course downwards, cannot run above twelve miles. Whereas, the true river Scamander, which he would make the Simois, took its rise in Ida, at a very great distance, near fifteen miles above Scepsis; and passed over a large tract of Country. The Author therefore puts a great force upon history, in order to maintain his notion about this river, which he supposes to be the Scamander. He owns, that it is narrow, and feeble: (p. 85.) and but fifteen feet wide, and three deep; (p. 74.) and tries to prove, that the Scamander of Homer was a tame and weak stream from a passage in the Poet, (φ. 308.) where the River-God Scamander, calls out for assistance. But this is all refinement; and affords not the least semblance of a proof. It is quite contrary to the description given by the Poet, which he overlooks. For the River, which Homer styles Scamander, is represented as-----*δινηεις, βαθυδινηεις* (φ. 143.) *εὐρροος* (H. 329.) *εὐρειος ποταμος* (φ. 1.) and *μεγας ποταμος βαθυδινης*. (Υ. 73. φ. 329.) It is by Pliny mentioned as—running into the sea and stiled Scamander,—*amnis navigabilis*. L. 5. p. 285. How could all this be said of a brook, only *fifteen feet wide and three in depth*? The

† Φιλε κασιγνητε, σθενος αμφοτεροι περ' Σχωμεν.

Αλλ' επαμυνε ταχιστα, [και εμπετιληθη ρεσθρα 'Υδατος εκ πηγων. The whole of the description is apparently a poetical fiction. We cannot form an argument from apologue.

Simois of old joined the chief river somewhere high up; and was lost in it. All below to the mouth was the Scamander, quite to the sea.

Achilles says to a person whom he had slain---Ουδε σε μητηρ Ενθεμενη λεχέσσει γονησεται· αλλα Σκαμανδρος Οισει δινηεις εισω αλος ευρεα κολπον. Φ. 123.

He speaks in the like manner of the same river to the Trojans.

Ουδ' υμιν ποταμος περ ευρεος αργυροδινης Αρκεσει. ν. 129.

Every article shews, that it was the purpose of the Poet to describe no narrow nor feeble rivulet; but an ample stream; and the principal of the two rivers—ποταμος μεγας, βαθυδινης Σκαμανδρος. By these terms he could never mean the subordinate, and ignoble Simois. I say, *ignoble*, for it is seldom mentioned; and never with any epithet, that can give it the least consequence. Nothing at all characteristic is afforded, though the Poet in general abounds with epithets. Hence we may judge, in what little estimation it was held: and be further assured, that a stream, so mean, and so short in its course, could not be the Scamander of Homer; nor the river of Pliny, which entered the sea. The Author therefore is wrong in making this the principal river, and supposing it to run through the Camp of the Grecians.

Farther account of the Scamander, and the situation of the Camp.

If we may trust to the words of Homer, we may have from him certain proof, that the Scamander could not run through the Camp; for it was the boundary of it to the left. The station of Ajax was close to it, and the ultimate that way. Next to Ajax upon the coast downward were the ships of Protefilaus: after him those of Idomeneus and Nestor. Hence it is said, when Hector was engaged upon the left, of the Grecian army, that he was fighting upon the banks of the Scamander; and did not know what was going forward in the center.

----- ουδε παρ' Εκτωρ.

Πευθετ', επει ρα μαχης επ' αριστερα μαρνато πασης,

Οχθας παρ' ποταμοιο Σκαμανδρος----Ιλ. Α. ν. 469.

Hector was quite ignorant of the event, for he was engaged upon the left, near the

the banks of the river Scamander. The ships of Achilles were to the right at the other extremity, where the Trojans never ventured. An account to the same purpose is given in another part, where Hector being at that time in the center was not apprised of his friends being slain-----*ἐπ' αριστερά νηών,-----to the left of the ships* near the river.

Ενθ' ἔσαν Αἰάντος τε νῆες, καὶ Πρωτέσιλαος,

Θιν' ἐφ' ἄλος πολλῆς εἰδυμέναι-----*Where the ships of Ajax were drawn up upon the sea shore.* N. v. 675. The Poet again describes Ajax in this situation.

-----Αἰάντα μάχης ἐπ' αριστερά πασῆς

Θαρσύνοντ' ἑταρῶς. P. v. 116. We find he was upon the left encouraging his foldiers. Here Afius was slain by Idomeneus, who was stationed very near to Ajax:-----*Εἰσατο γὰρ νηών ἐπ' αριστερά.* M. v. 117. Whenever therefore the course of the Scamander can be by Authors ascertained, we can determine the left of the Grecian ships; and the situation of the Camp may be proved according to the idea of Homer. I have mentioned, that both the river and ships were low down towards Alexandria Troas, and Lectum, the same as Ida: which Lectum was the boundary of Phrygia Major to the south, and beyond it was Antandros in Mysia. This position seems to agree well with the statement afforded by some of the best Geographers of old as may be seen by the list annexed.

<i>Ptolemy Geog.</i> p. 137.	<i>Pliny, Vol. 1. C. v.</i> p. 282.	<i>Strabo, L. 13.</i> p. 891.
Lampſacus		
Abydus		Abydus
Dardanum		Dardanum
Simoeis	Portus Archivorum	Rhæteum
Scamander	Sigeum	Sigeum
Sigeum	Scamander	Portus Archivorum
Alexandrea Troas	Nee	Oſtia Scamandri
Lectum	Alexandrea	Lectum

I have

I have observed, that the Rhœtean and Sigeian promontories were unknown to Homer : we may therefore set them aside in the instances afforded above. All that we have to observe is, that according to these Writers, the Scamander was not far from Alexandria, and Lectum, the same as Ida Gargarus. The ships therefore and Camp, must have been in the lower and southern part of the region : and the City in the like situation, only inland.

The Author's System still farther maintained by him.

Notwithstanding these obstacles, the Author thinks, that he can most assuredly ascertain the situation of ancient Troy: and says. p. 119. *I hope, that the following strict mathematical demonstration will prove it beyond doubt. The Scæan, or western Gate, was that, which faced the Plain. From this gate the Trojans issued out. The sources of the Scamander lay in front, and in view of the Scæan gate. The gate was therefore to the west of the city. When it is once granted, that I am exact with respect to the sources of the Scamander, it must be allowed, that I am right, as to the situation of the City of Troy. That this is to the east of the sources is strictly and unquestionably demonstrated.* I fear, that we must have better evidence, before we arrive at probability: and, after all, we shall fall far short of Demonstration. The whole is founded in surmise: and the question is begged in the first, and essential, article. The Author took his stand upon a hill above Bounarbachi: and conceived, that here of old stood the city of Troy: though the situation is quite inconsistent with the position given by the Poet. He then formed an idea of the Scæan gate to the west: to which we might possibly subscribe, if the situation of the city be true. But that has not been proved; though it was the first article to be ascertained. Somewhat more than a mile below this place is a hot spring, and at a distance some other fountains: which he supposes to be the sources of the Scamander. In this manner he would prove the identity of the springs from the situation of the Gate and City: and the situation of the

3 Τα μὲν οὖν ὄρημα ἐκλελειφθαι εἶκος. Strabo, L. 13. p. 89.

City and Gate from the position of the springs. But this disposition of the objects is founded merely in fancy, and every part of the argument is destitute of support. We have no proof, that the ancient City stood upon the eminence, where he has placed it: nor are there any grounds to suppose, that the different springs so far below, were the two fountains mentioned by Homer. We may be also assured, that the scanty brook, into which they run, was not the Scamander. Every article is not merely doubtful; but in great measure contradicted by the best histories. Such a precarious series of arguments will not, I fear, be readily admitted either for a strict mathematical, or for a logical, Demonstration: nor will they even arise to a degree of probability. In short it is well known, that hot springs as well as cold, abounded in Phrygia, and the neighbouring regions; where the soil was particularly affected by subterraneous fires; and in consequence of it liable to terrible earthquakes. The springs mentioned by Homer were not to be found in the time of Strabo, as we are by him assured. It is therefore in vain to look for them now: nor must we suppose, if a hot fountain appears, that it is necessarily that of the Poet. The pursuit of Achilles was throughout under the walls of the City.----Τειχεος αὖτις ὑπ' ἐκ; and there were the springs of the Poet, and not a mile and half below. Add to this, that the cold spring in Homer is single, and the hot spring close beside it. But the Author instead of one cold fountain produces many at some distance from each other: and the hot spring described by him is farthest of all, and not much less than half a mile distant from the nearest. All this is quite contrary to the disposition mentioned by the Poet; we cannot therefore from such data, determine the Scæan Gate, nor demonstrate the situation of Troy.

The situation of the two Springs of the Poet determined by the flight of Hector.

The investigation above will serve to throw much light upon the pursuit of Achilles, when Hector fled before. The whole of this course
was

was beneath the walls of the City. This is manifest from many passages in the Poet,—

-----τρεσε δ' Ἑκτωρ
Τειχος ὑπο Τρωων. χ. v. 43.

Hector fled in a panick beneath the Trojan Wall.
Jupiter is made to say—

Ω ποποι, η φιλον ανδρα διωκομενον ὑπο τειχος
Οφθαλμοισιν ορωμαι----αυ περι Πριαμοιο. 173.

Alas! I see a man, whom I hold dear, pursued under the wall---and about the City.—Αυτος δε ποτι ποτολιος πετετ' αιει. 198.-----*Hector was continually pressing to get towards the City.*

Pallas says to him----

-----η μαλα δη σε βιαζεται ωκυς Αχιλλευσ
Αυ περι Πριαμοιο ποσιν ταχεσσι διωκων. v. 229.

Indeed I see that Achilles presses hard upon you in his eager pursuit about the City. In the mean time, the distance was so small, that Priam and the Trojans beheld the whole, and Hector was called to by them, and implored to enter the City. The army of the Grecians was by repute an hundred thousand men. But, if it were but forty thousand, it must have extended many miles to the right, and left, and precluded all intercourse between Troy and the plain below. The flight continued, till the two Chieftains had approached the fountains four times in their course—*Ἄλλ' οτε δε το τεταρτον επι κρυνης αφικοντο, v. 208.*—*but when at last they came a fourth time to the fountains,* then Hector was unfortunately induced to make a stand. Here he ventured to engage Achilles, and by these fountains he was slain. This was so near the City, that Priam and Hecuba beheld the whole; which they witnessed by their sorrow, and lamentations. v. 405. This affords farther evidence, that the fountains of Homer, from their proximity to the wall, could not be those a mile and more below, and consequently far removed from the spot, where it has been supposed that Troy was situated.

Concerning

Concerning the tradition of Hector's flight three times round Troy, and of his body when slain, dragged as often round the walls.

The learned Gentlemen, of whom I have been speaking, very justly explode this idle notion, and have made some very proper remarks upon the subject. Here Strabo is fortunately on their side; and speaking of several circumstances in the Ilias, which are difficult to be reconciled, he adds, οὐδ' ἡ τῆς Ἑκτορος περιδρομῆς ἢ περὶ τὴν πόλιν εἶχει τι εὐλογον. L. 13. p. 895. *Nor is the flight of Hector* (which is said to have been three times round the walls) *attended with the least shew of propriety.* He accordingly tells us, that the place, where he imagines ancient Ilium to have stood, could not, on account of an intervening hill, have been compassed in the manner supposed. When therefore Hector is made to say----

Τρεῖς περὶ αὖτις μέγα διον.---χ. 251.

Three times have I fled round the great City of Priam: the principal word, upon which the whole turns, has been misunderstood. The Author therefore of the Description says, p. 135.---*I am persuaded, that the difficulty in question proceeds entirely from the way of explaining the preposition περὶ, which often signifies round, or round about; but is also used by Authors, as well as by Homer himself, to express the Latin juxta, prope, ad, or the English near beside, hard by.*

In the notes we find a number of instances to this purpose, whereby the true meaning of the word is ascertained. I agree with these learned Gentlemen entirely: and think, that the word, so far from necessarily signifying *all round*, and *in a circuit*, does not oftentimes take in both sides. A Writer therefore to express his full meaning is sometimes obliged to add the word ἀμφι. Hence it is said of the Grecians at Aulis,----

Ἡμεῖς δ' ἀμφι περὶ κρήνην ἱερὰς κατὰ βωμῶν
Ἐρδομεν Ἀθανάτοισι τελευσσας Ἑκατομβῆας. B. 305.

We sacrificed to the immortal Gods at the altar, standing round about the sacred stream. Apollonius says of the golden Fleece—

G

αὖτις Τροίης

-----Τοιος μιν ὄφιν περὶ ἀμφὶ ἐρύται,
 Ἀθανάτος καὶ αὔπνους. L. 2. v. 1212.

But the signification is particularly manifest, when the Trojans are described, as assaulting the Grecian camp with fire in their hands, in order to burn the fleet. Before the camp was a rampart, which extended across the plain, and was the defence of the navy. It is said, at the assault given by the enemy,----that the scene was past describing----

Πάντη γὰρ περὶ τείχος ὀρώρει θεσπιδάες πυρ----M. 177.

Here the fire was so far from surrounding the wall, that it was only on one side. But when both sides are included, then the word ἀμφὶ is often added; which circumstance happens, when the armies are engaged both within and without.

Πολλὰ δὲ τεύχεα καλὰ πρὸς περὶ ἀμφὶ τε τάφρον. P. 760.

Bright weapons fell all about the ditch and rampart on each side.

It gives me pleasure to do, as far as I am able, justice to the sagacity and judgement of these two learned Gentlemen.

I am, however, obliged to dissent in one article: and cannot think, that the flight of Hector, was as they maintain, *in a circular direction*. p. 136. 7. Had the Heroes taken a large circuit, Hector must at times have been driven towards the wall, and have gotten between Achilles, and the City. This was certainly his endeavour, but we are told by the Poet, that he could never effect it.

Ὡς Ἑκτωρ ἔλθε ποδῶκεα Πηλεΐωνα,
 Ὅσσακι δ' ὀρμησεὶ πυλάων Δαρδανιδῶν,
 Ἀντίον αἰξασθαι εὐδμήτης ἐπὶ Πύργῳ,
 Εἰπὼς οἱ καθυπερθεὶν ἀλαλκοῖσιν βέλεσσι,
 Τόσσακι μιν προπαροῖθεν ἀποσρεψάσκε παράσας
 Πρὸς πρὸ γ', αὐτὸς δὲ ποτὶ πτόλιος πέτετ' αἶει. χ. v. 193, 4, &c.

Troy, we know, was supposed to have seven gates. To some of these gates Hector tried to make his way; but the poet tells us, that his purpose

purpose was always defeated. *He could not deceive Achilles: for, as often, as he made an effort to get near to one of these gates, in order to be protected by his friends above, so often did Achilles get before him and turn him towards the plain.* Hence I conjecture that their course could not be in a circular direction; but irregular, and often interrupted, being carried on with dodging, and evasion. Indeed, if the flight was, as is generally supposed, in a high road, it is manifest, ^{it} that could not be circular. But this demands some consideration.

It is said, at the beginning of Hector's flight, that he left the Scæan gate, where he at first had taken his station, and sped away, not daring to meet Achilles.

-----τρεσε δ' Εκτωρ

Τειχος ὑπο Τρωων, λαβηρα τε γυνατ' ενωμα.

Achilles immediately pursues him, and they both press forward under the wall of the City, and in the great high road.

Τειχος αιεν ὑπ' εκ κατ' αμαξιτον εσσευον]ο. χ. 143.

αμαξιτον, αμαξηλατον οδον. Schol.—*the way, which waggons went.* As Troy is said to have had seven gates, there was undoubtedly a road from each of them, which led into different parts of the Country. If then they were both in the same road, as is represented, Hector must either have been forced into the Country, which we know was not the case; or else been driven towards the City. But it is hardly credible, that Achilles should be represented as pressing him in his flight towards the Towers and walls: for it was the very thing, which the one wished for, and the other strove to prevent. As often as Hector made an effort that way—ποσσακι μιν προπαροιθεν αποσρεψασκε παρασας προς πεδιον.---χ. 196. *so often did Achilles get before him, and stood between him and the wall, and turned him again towards the plain, and Country.* This has sometimes made me think that another solution may be given to the Poet's words. For a circular flight could not have been maintained in a high road.

HAMAXITUS.

Though by αμαξιτος, amaxitus, has been generally understood a road, or high way, even as far back as the writing of the Scholia, yet I have often thought, that it was a proper name, and related to a City of Troas. It lay very near to the Pagus Iliensium, where Demetrius and Strabo supposed Troy to have stood, and not far from Scepsis, but to the south. They were all in the vicinity of Lectum, or Ida proper; which stood near, and upon the sea. Homer expresses the name Amaxitus without an asperate, whereas all the Writers of Hellas uniformly prefixed that spirit. But this is of little consequence: for the Cities of Troas were peopled by the Æolians from Cuma: and the whole region belonged to them from the Hermus to Abydus north, and even to Cyzicus, as we learn from Strabo. L. 13. p. 877. He says in consequence of it, that Troas and Æolis were the same, the one being a part of the other. *ibid.* Now the Æolians were remarkable for leaving out the aspirate. *Æoles asperum semper vertunt in tenuem, quem ob id H. Stephanus Æolicum vocat, ipsosque Æolas ψιλωτικες. Eustathius. Jacobus Zuingerus de Dialectis.* They pronounced ηλιος for ήλιος: ημερα for ήμερα: consequently Amaxitus for Hamaxitus. Homer therefore very properly writes the name, as the natives pronounced it, but others prefix the asperate. Stephanus Byzantinus takes notice of the place, as a small City or Town.—Αμαξιτος πολυχνιον της Τρωαδος. Pliny also speaks of it, and describes it as the first place, which occurred in Troas, in coming from Mysia; and the cities of Æolis, which were to the south. At the same time, he gives a precise account of the places near it. *Troadis primus locus Hamaxitus, dein Cebrenia, ipsaque Troas, nunc Alexandria: Oppidum Nee: Scamander amnis navigabilis, et in promontorio quondam Sigeum oppidum, in quem fluit ¹ Xanthus Simoenti junctus, stagnumque faciens Palæscamander.—Est tamen et nunc Scamandria Civitas parva: ac MD passus remotum a portu Ilium immune.* Vol. 1. L. 5. p. 282. Strabo mentions Hamaxitus as being situated near Lectum, or Ida proper. —ή Αμαξιτος, ή τω Λεκτώ υπεκειμενη συνεχης. L. 13 p. 901.

¹ The Xanthus was the upper part of the Scamander.

Οι Ξανθοι καλεσσι θιοι, ανδρες δε Σκαμανδρον.

When therefore it is said by Homer.

Τειχεος αἰεν ὑπ' ἐκ κατ' Ἀμαξιτον ἐσσεύοντο.

The meaning is, that the two Heroes in the beginning of their career bent their way beneath the wall in the direction towards Hamaxitus. Hector, as often as he was intercepted from gaining the wall, stopped short and doubled; and so returned the same way back. The Poet makes use of this place as a land mark to shew in what direction they at first sped. At all rates we may perceive, that the Troy of Homer was low down, and in the south west part of Troas, not far from Mount Lectum. If it ever existed, it must be looked for here. And we may perceive from the words of Pliny, that Hamaxitus was the first place, that occurred in Troas to a person, who entered the Country by the road of Xerxes leaving Ida on the left hand. For this was the grand road for those, who journeyed from the south; and was formed by a passage through the mountains. Mount Ida proper being to the left, and the Bithynian, or Idæan Mountains to the right.

Of the supposed Tombs of Grecian Warriors near Troy.

The Author with a pleasing enthusiasm speaks of the mound of earth, which he saw in Troas, as the real Tombs of persons, to whom they were attributed by the Grecian Writers. But the true site of Troy was never ascertained, nor of the Camp of the Grecians: the latter of which some have placed opposite to Thrace; and others far lower down upon the Hellespont. The ¹ Phrygians and Mysians, a ² Thracian people, were the first, who settled upon this coast. It was their custom to raise ³ barrows over their dead: and there is reason to think, that those mentioned here by Strabo, Pliny, and other Writers, were the work of these

¹ Οἱ Μυσοί, Θρακὲς οὐτὲς. — Οἱ Φρυγες —

Θρακίον τοῦ εἴδους. Strabo, L. 7. p. 453. L. 10. p. 722.

Τὰ παρ' Ἀβυδὸν Θρακὲς (ἐπωκῆσαν) L. 13. p. 877. C.

² Τὰ περὶ τῶν Φρυγῶν, καὶ τῶν Μυσῶν, λεγόμενα πρῶτον τῶν Τρωικῶν ἐστὶ. ibid. L. 12. p. 858.

³ Herodotus mentions the manner of their burying their dead — *χωμα χιαντες*, by raising a mound of earth, or barrow, over them. L. 5. C. 8. p. 375.

nations.

nations. The Trojan names of places were in great measure ¹ Thracian. When, many ages after the supposed æra of Troy, the writings of Homer came to be publickly known, the Grecians, as soon as they got access to the regions of Phrygia, tried to make every object, which they saw there, accord with the history of the poem: but were in a continual state of ² contradiction. They determined at hazard, and accommodated every thing to their own fancy. They first present us with the tomb of Memnon near the Æsepus, many miles above Troy, ³ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκβολῆς τῆς Αἰσηπεῖς ----Μεμνόνος ταφός. Next we find two separate tombs of ⁴ Achilles, and Patroclus; and at some distance another of ⁵ Antilochus: who, according to Homer, were all buried together. The ashes of Achilles and Patroclus were mixed, and in the same urn: those of Antilochus apart, but in the same tomb.

Μιγδα δὲ Πατροκλοῖο Μενoitιαδαο θανόντος, χωρὶς δ' Ἀντιλοχοῖο Ω. 77. Odyss. I believe, there is no instance of three persons, who where buried in the same mound, having additionally three separate Tombs raised for them in the same place.

After the demolition of Troy, Agamemnon is said to have collected his booty, and his captives, among which was Hecuba and to have sailed directly homeward. Of this we have an account Odyss. Δ. v. 512. But there was a monument in Thrace, called κυνός σημα, which the Grecians interpreted—the monument of the dog, and feigned, that it was the tomb of Hecuba, transformed to that animal. But Cunosema was a promontory above Sigeum considerably, and on the opposite coast of the Hellespont. Strabo L. 13. p. 889. Whither Hecuba, as far as we can learn from Homer, was never transported: for Agamemnon is supposed to have carried her directly to Greece.

¹ Πολλὰ δ' ἐπωνυμίας Θραξί καὶ Τρασίν.—Οἷον Σκαῖοι, Θρακίαι, καὶ Σκαίος ποταμός.—καὶ ἐν Τροίῃ Σκαῖαι πυλαί. Strabo L. 13. p. 883.—Σκαῖοι, εἶδος Θρακικόν. Hesych.—The same affirmed, L. 13. p. 872.

² Οὐδὲν ὅλως ἀλλήλοις ὁμολογουντες. Strabo L. 13. p. 873.

³ Strabo L. 13. p. 878.

⁴ Strabo L. 13. p. 891. See Ptolemy Geog. p. 117.

⁵ Πατροκλῆ καὶ Ἀντιλόχου μῆμα. ibid.

In like manner there was a barrow upon the same coast of Thrace, where Protefilaus was supposed to have been buried. This Hero was killed by Hector upon the first landing of the Grecians at Troas: and it is natural to suppose, that he was buried, where he fell. But we find him on the contrary deposited higher up and upon the opposite shore of the Hellespont; and in an enemy's country. For the Thracians of the Chersonesus were allies of the Trojans, and came to their assistance under the command of Mentès. But, if they had been friends of the Grecians, yet why should the body of this Hero, of all others, have been carried from the place, where he fell? How uncertain these accounts are, we may learn from Virgil, who, as well as Euripides, mentions that the Thracians were not enemies, but allies of the Trojans; and that their King Polymeſtor was a particular friend of Priam. They say also, that this King murdered Polydorus, the youngest son of his Trojan Ally; and buried him under a barrow. But, if we may believe Homer, Polydorus was not murdered by Polymeſtor, nor ever in Thrace: and consequently had no such tomb. He was killed by Achilles, as may be seen at large—*Æ.* v. 407, &c.---Whom then are we to believe? Virgil and Euripides? or Homer? I leave the reader to choose. I shall only observe, that the history of these tumuli is precarious: and has been determined at random by the later inhabitants of the Country. For these mounds of earth were ancient Thracian barrows, founded prior to the æra of Troy; but appropriated by the Grecians long afterwards to people of their own nation, just as fancy directed. Hence we find some in Asia, some in Europe: some in Troas, some above it, widely separated; all which, according to the histories afforded, should have been limited to the same spot, if they had belonged to people who fell at Troy.

Some have tried to remedy this contradiction by supposing the Polydorus of Homer to have been by another mother. Polydorus was the name of one and the same person, the youngest son of Priam; whose history has been differently told, and in a manner quite contradictory.

A vindication of Clemens Alexandrinus.

The Author quotes too boldly; and incautiously applies to Writers, with whom he seems not to have been sufficiently acquainted. He says, p. 50. *I should not be surpris'd to find, that after the establishment of Christianity the temples and tombs of ancient Warriors had been consign'd to oblivion.* I should have been equally surpris'd, if they had not: for how could it be expected, that Christians should pay any attention to them? But to proceed—*It is universally known, with what zeal Clemens Alexandrinus oppos'd this species of idolatry, and how vehemently he inveigh'd against the first Christians for lavishing upon these numerous tombs that incense, which was only due to the ¹ Deity,* p. 50. The zeal of Clemens would have been very laudable, if it had shewn itself upon such an occasion, to prevent any superstitious observance. But what is mentioned *as universally known* is universally unknown. Not one word is to be found, in the place referred to, of the Christians lavishing incense; nor of their paying the least regard to tombs. I never knew a more palpable mistake, or a more bold and injurious assertion. Had Dr. Pococke, or Chandler been guilty of such a groundless accusation, the Author would have given them no quarter. The first Christians never disgrac'd their religion by such idolatrous practices. And it is a very unjust imputation, which is thus brought upon them. The learned Father's address is to the Gentiles, whom he wanted to convert. For them the whole Cohortatio was compos'd; whom the Author of the Description has taken for Christians. He has accordingly accus'd them of making offerings at the very tombs, which they held in abhorrence. Numbers laid down their lives to avoid any guilt of this kind. The passage, to which the ² Author refers us, is by his own account in the Cohortatio of Clemens, and in his third Chapter. Edit. Potter. Mention is there made, and throughout the whole Differ-

¹ The Author's manner of reasoning is somewhat uncommon. If what he says, were true, how could he expect the Christians to consign these tombs to oblivion, if they entertain'd an idolatrous veneration for them? Under such circumstances, the wonder would have been, if they had neglected them. But the whole is surpris'e without any object of wonder.

² See Description, &c. P. 50.

tation, of the objects of idolatry maintained of old by different Gentile Nations: and the absurdity of the worship is very properly exposed. But, as I said before, the name of Christian is not to be found in any part of the Chapter, to which he appeals. The whole is addressed to Grecian idolaters, and relates to the ancient worship of the Country, which they still maintained. This imputation concerning the first Christians is very rash and groundless. There is nothing in any part of the Cohortatio to this purpose.

Some wrong intimations.

The Author in the same place adds, by way of question, the lines following. *Why did not the (Christian) Priests of the lower empire demolish these monuments? Why did they leave a single trace of them behind? It was because they were well acquainted with the veneration, entertained by the Greeks for the Sepulchres of the dead: and perhaps they could not have devised a more effectual method of bringing them back to their ancient worship, and of ¹ alienating them from the new, than to attempt to violate the tombs of Warriors.* p. 50.

He is speaking of the Greeks of the lower Empire and in proof of what he asserts, he refers to Diodorus Siculus, Vol. 1. L. 13. p. 610. Edit. Wesseling. This, when I first saw it, seemed the strangest reference, that ever was made. For what possible proof, or even illustration, concerning the mode of acting among the Christians of the lower Empire can be obtained from a Writer, who wrote before Christianity commenced; and even before the its great Author was born? What is still more extraordinary, when we examine the passage, it has not the least relation to Greece, nor to the worship paid there at Tombs; but, strange to tell, to Annibal Rhodius, and the Carthaginians; and to an æra as far back as the 93d. Olympiad, 400 years before Christ. Mention indeed is there made of

¹ This could not possibly be true according to his own assertions. What fears could the Christians entertain about the people lapsing again into this species of Idolatry, if the priests practised it themselves from the beginning, and if you will believe him, offered incense at these very tombs. But the whole is a series of mistakes. See page 50 of his work.

monuments destroyed, and of a religious fear, in consequence of it. Also of a Tomb struck by lightning? when the people are said to have been much alarmed. But this has not the least connexion with Greece, and the lower Empire, nor with the worship then in use; which was above seven hundred years later.

When the Author speaks of the Church in the time of the Emperors, and says, that the Priests knew the veneration, in which the people held the Tombs of their Warriors, and therefore did not presume to demolish them, the whole is a supposition without any authority. There is not the least reason to suppose, that the Priests had any such apprehensions, or the people any such attachment. It is likewise too great a refinement to imagine, that the removal of the object would be the cause of adoration. Christianity, which he styles new, had been for some Centuries introduced, and was by law established. And so far were the Priests in these times from apprehending any ill consequences from these tombs, that they did not regard them with the least notice. And instead of offering incense upon them, as has been wrongly supposed, both Priests and people lapsed into a similar mode of idolatry, and made offerings at the tombs of their own Saints, and Martyrs. This precluded all worship, and reverence, at the sepulchres of Deities and Heroes. As to the notion about destroying them, the early Christians had no power to effect it; and the later no inclination. They did not think them of the least consequence.

There is something in the allegation above the most extraordinary, that I ever encountered. Writers generally, when they are inclined to find fault, direct their censure towards something which has been done. The Author acts the very reverse, and founds his censure upon what has not been done; and calls people to account, who are confessedly quite blameless: and from what they did not do, he infers, what they would have done, could they have had their will. All this is levelled at the early Christians: for which Christians, and for Christianity itself, I hope, he has more regard, than he seems to shew by taking such unnecessary and indirect means to defame them.

Of PAUSANIAS.

The Author, p. 48, speaks of Pausanias as *one of the greatest Geographers among the Ancients*. But Pausanias was no more a Geographer, than Plot, Dugdale, Leland, or Lambard among us. He was properly an Antiquary, who confined his observations to Greece: with the rest of the world he was little concerned. His purpose was to take notice of the principal cities within the Peloponnesus, and without: and to describe the ancient Temples, rites, and Deities: also the statues and pictures, fountains and groves, with the little histories, by which they were illustrated. The Author mentions it likewise as *a surprising circumstance, that Pausanias never visited the Troad*, p. 48. Whether he did or not, is of little consequence: and either way no object of surprise. At the same time, I know not by what authority, the Author is determined, when he makes this assertion. Besides how was Pausanias at all concerned with Troy? I do not believe, that the name occurs once in all his work. And, if there be any allusion to the City under the name of Ilium, it is always brief, and introduced incidentally: as the history of that place was quite foreign to his purpose. The whole of his views were confined to Hellas: and not extended to the World in general. The portion of the earth, with which he was concerned, is scarcely three degrees square. It is therefore as wrong to stile Pausanias *one of the greatest Geographers of the ancients*, as it is to call Strabo *a blunderer*.

Concerning some strictures, with which I am noticed.

I wish that the Author for his own sake had passed me by unregarded: for I find my name introduced among those of other Writers, whom he has been unduly led to censure. In the description of the Tumuli in Troas, a passage is brought from my Analysis of Grecian Mythology, in which the Author thinks that I have been greatly mistaken, and gone contrary to every Writer upon the subject. He accordingly quotes my words

at large, and then passes sentence upon them. What I had unfortunately advanced, was as follows. Mention had been made, that the Tumuli in Egypt were styled Tapha: of which many instances were produced; and for this a reason was given. For—*the Natives were obliged to raise the soil, on which they built their Edifices, in order to secure them from the inundation of the Nile: and many of their sacred Towers were erected upon conical mounds of earth. But there were often hills of the same form construed for religious purposes; upon which there was no building. These were very common in Egypt. Hence we read of Taph-banes, Taph-Ofiris, Taph-Ofiris parva, and Contra Taphus, in Antoninus. In other parts were Taphiusa, Tape, Taphusa, &c. &c. But as it was usual in ancient times to bury persons of distinction under heaps of earth formed in this fashion, these Tapha came to signify Tombs: and almost all the sacred mounds raised for religious purposes were looked upon as monuments of deceased Heroes. The Greeks speak of numberless sepulchral monuments, which they have thus interpreted. They pretended to shew the Tomb of Dionysus at Delphi: also of Deucalion, Pyrrha, and Orion in other places. They imagined, that Jupiter was buried in ¹ Crete: Upon this the Author animadvert, and says.—Mr. Bryant here endeavours to prove, that the Greeks were mistaken in supposing, what were sacred mounds to be tombs of Heroes. I must beg to be excused: for what I said with limitation, and as happening occasionally must not be introduced, as a general and uniform opinion or practice. Such an inference is unjust; and contrary to my express words. He proceeds. But the concurring testimony of Homer, and all antiquity is sufficient to convince us, that they had no other way of preserving their ashes than by depositing them under these hillocks. p. 89. How does this in the least prove, that there were not tumuli erected for another purpose? At the same time how can it with any degree of plausibility be said, that the Grecians had no other way of preserving the ashes of persons deceased, than by depositing them in the manner mentioned? Had they not Temples, publick buildings, Mausolea,—Μνημεία, Οβελισκοί, Στήλαι, under which people were buried? We read of Tombs of exquisite*

¹ Other instances to a great amount might have been brought from Lycophron, Pausanias, and other Writers.

workmanship, *ἔσσοι λίθοι, ἔσσοι ταφοί, ἔσσαι πέτραι*. What is extraordinary the ashes of Homer, according to the Author's own opinion, are preserved in a Sarcophagus of stone. That they buried people under heaps of earth was never by me denied: to which the Author has not duly attended: and from a particular mode of burial would infer a general usage. His learned Friend has brought a variety of proofs to shew, that not only the Grecians, but people long since have interred persons of consequence under mounds of earth: and he might have added people of no consequence, as every Church Yard will witness. but this does not affect me; and is therefore quite unnecessary: for it is what I always allowed, as may be seen by the very words, which the Author quotes from me. For I mention, in the most unequivocal terms, *that it was usual in ancient times to bury people of distinction under heaps of earth formed in this fashion*. The authorities brought in opposition prove my words: But, however numerous they may be, and however they may shew, that people were buried under such tumuli; yet they do not prove, that there were no such mounds, where people were not buried, and which were erected for another purpose. For this, if it were necessary, I could bring evidence in abundance. How can we suppose that a sacred mound dedicated to Bacchus, Jupiter, Ceres, Orion, Deucalion, Pyrrha, or any other of those fabled personages, was a real place of burial, though called *ἱ τυμβος*. There were many such Tumuli in Egypt and Arabia, styled tombs of ² Osiris. But can we suppose, that one and the same person was buried in so many different places. Besides the Egyptians, as we are told, esteemed Osiris as the Sun: and, Isis as the moon. At other times a plastick nature, *φύσις*; by which all things were produced. However

¹ We meet with many places of worship under this name.

Τυμβος ἱερὰς ὀπλισμίας. Lycophron. v. 613.

Τυμβον, aram. Potter. v. 335.

Τυμβος (Μαντιον). Lycoph. 1050.

Mercurii Theutatis Tumulus. Livy. L. 26.

Ἦδη ὑπὲρ ποταμίου, ὅθι Ἑρμαιοῦ Λοφὸς ἐστίν. Odyss. π. v. 471.

Ἑρμαιοῦ Λοφὸς εἰς τιμὴν τῆς Θεῆς. Hesych.

Instances without number might be brought from Diodorus, and Pausanias, as well as from other Historians.

² Diodorus. L. 1. p. 23. C.

then the Grecians might misinterpret these Tumuli, and represent them as Sepulchres: the Natives of Egypt thought very differently. They never conceived, that the sun could be concealed in a hillock, or Nature be buried in a barrow.

What is extraordinary, after it has been asserted, and a long process carried on in the notes, to shew, that *the concurring testimony of Homer, and all antiquity, prove me to be greatly mistaken*, in supposing, that some of these Tumuli were raised for a religious purpose; the Author seems to forget himself in the space of five lines; and says—*some few of them might be particularly consecrated to the ceremonies of religion*. p. 92. But this is shifting quicker than a weather-cock, and ruins all that has been asserted. He allows me the very article, which he had before denied me, and maintains, what he had just controverted. In short he has kept up an opposition, ~~w~~ere we are both agreed.

This perhaps may appear of no great consequence: yet after all it is trifling with characters, which a noble and ingenuous mind should be very cautious of arraigning. We ought to consider well, before we found our own reputation upon anothers ruin: and at all rates we should have truth on our side.

Conclusion and Apology.

I have been carried on, in the course of these observations contrary to my general plan of study, being for the most part engaged in pursuits of a more serious nature. But I thought, it would be an act of justice to soften those severe censures, of which the Author of the Description, through too great a zeal for his system, has unwarily been guilty. Indeed it is the duty of all persons, who have opportunity and power, to retrieve the characters of those, to whose learning and merit they have been beholden: and to take off any undue impressions. This I have endeavoured to effect in favour of Dr. Chandler, and others: and, I hope, it is executed in a manner, that cannot give any just offence. Though, if I had ac-
ted

ted differently I should have the Author's sanction for my mode of proceeding. For he says, p. 75. *When in open contempt of every guide, we wander far away from the truth, we then forfeit all title to mercy: and become obnoxious to the rigour of criticism.*

I likewise imagined, that a disquisition of this kind might in some degree illustrate the purpose of Homer, and determine the Geography of his Poem, as far as it can be ascertained. There are certainly some seeming inconsistencies in the Ilias, and subsequent Poem, which it may not be easy to reconcile. For, as I have in another place observed, a fable of any length will never be consistent: and I look upon these poems of Homer concerning the expedition of the Greeks, and the rape of Helen, to be mere fables. I am persuaded, that no such war, as has been represented, was carried on against Troy: nor do I believe, that the Phrygian City, so zealously sought after, ever existed. For this I could bring very cogent proof, should such a disquisition be at all acceptable to the World.



ERRATA.

Introduction, Page iii. l. 3. after Chevalier *dele* comma.

Page 3. l. 16. for Scæan, read Scæan.

— 4. l. 20. for Sigæan, read Sigean.

— 10. l. 9. for *ἰσοδορ*, read *οἰσοδορ*.

— 15. l. 28. for Metrodofus, read Metrodorus.

— 25. l. 29. after they issued, *add* both.

— 37. l. 7. after that *add* it.

— 41. l. 9. for seperate, read separate.

